## PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES OF 05/23/05

**2005-0287** – Application for a Design Review on a 9,920 square-foot site to allow a new two-story home totaling 4,302 square feet exceeding the 4,050 square foot threshold requiring Planning Commission review. The property is located at **1339 Navarro Drive** (near Bryant Way) in an R-1 (Low-Density Residential) Zoning District. (APN: 313-12-028) GC

**Gerri Caruso**, Principal Planner, presented the staff report. This proposal is for a new two-story house that is approximately 1,500 square feet larger than the existing home and will include a three-car garage and up to seven bedrooms. The structure does not exceed the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) of 45%, but this project requires Planning Commission review because it exceeds a second adopted threshold of 4,050 square feet. Staff believes it complies with all development standards including the single-family design guidelines. There are no expected impacts to the neighborhood and the site is located in a neighborhood that is changing and includes both older, small and custom large, homes. The size of this home is not unusually large for this neighborhood. The applicant has also provided a solar shadow allowance and the structure will not shade more than 10% of any adjacent structure.

Comm. Simons asked staff for clarification related to the single-family design guidelines in regards to the bold tall gable entryway design guidelines that discuss roof orientation and when to avoid using bold gable entries. He commented that in the past staff has discouraged the taller gable entry and asked staff to comment on why they did not discourage the taller gable entry on this project. Ms. Caruso said that it was staff's opinion that this entry way was lower than a second-story and the shape of the entry level roof matched the direction of the front portion of the garage roof making the entryway compatible with the house, but that staff would have no problem if the Commission felt it should be lower. Comm. Simons commented he would like to see consistency on the tall gable issue. In the past he has supported some of the grander entryways, but was trying to get a better understanding of staff's thoughts on this issue.

**Comm. Babcock** noticed a new Condition of Approval (COA), COA 3. regarding Accessory Living Units (ALU) and asked why we do not see this on a routine basis. Ms. Caruso said she added it to the COAs because this is a large unit and it potentially could have an ALU in the future. This is a reminder to obtain a separate Miscellaneous Plan Permit in the future if the applicant decides to add an ALU. Trudi Ryan, Planning Officer, commented that ALUs are only permitted on lots of 9000 sq. ft. or greater in R-0 (Low Density Residential, 6000 sq. ft. minimum lot size) or R-1 (Low Density Residential, 8000 sq. ft. minimum lot size) Zoning Districts, so most of the items Planning Commission has reviewed would not qualify to add an ALU. The City cannot prohibit someone from adding an ALU

but can impose other conditions. Comm. Babcock asked if only one ALU could be added. Ms. Ryan said only one ALU could be added.

**Chair Moylan** asked that if a lot is already carved up with legal, non-conforming ALUs, can we impose this COA 3. now and any new house would be under the new regulations. Ms. Ryan said if non-conforming situations are removed, then the lot no longer has a legal non-conforming status.

**Comm. Babcock** asked why this neighborhood was rezoned from R-0 to R-1. Ms. Caruso said there was a study issue and the neighbors asked Council to rezone the neighborhood to R-1 in order to maintain the character of the neighborhood to protect subdivision of large lots resulting in more single-family units.

**Comm. Klein** asked what portion of the site made staff think a secondary living unit might be added. Ms. Caruso said that because the lot is large and there is significant floor space that the applicant needed to know that adding an ALU could not automatically be done.

**Chair Moylan** asked about the large palm tree in the front of the house and whether it is a protected heritage tree as the report says there are no protected heritage trees on the site. Ms. Caruso said when the report was being written she did not know exactly how large the tree was and wording in the report was added to protect any tree that measures 38 inches or greater in circumference.

## Chair Moylan opened the public hearing.

**So John Salud**, applicant, stated that he respectfully asks the Planning Commissioner's to approve this plan as it is his dream house and feels it is good for his family and for the community as many of the neighbors are making their houses in the neighborhood more modern. He also commented that the existing house has seven bedrooms, no dining room, no family room and no garage. This proposed plan is bigger to accommodate the addition of these items.

## Chair Moylan closed the public hearing.

Comm. Sulser made a motion to approve the design review with the recommended conditions. Comm. Klein seconded.

**Comm. Sulser** said that he has mixed feelings about the design of the project as the garage has become the dominant architectural feature. He also commented that other houses in the neighborhood also have dominant garages so he is able to support this. He is happy that the applicant is upgrading his home and it should be a nice addition to the neighborhood.

Page 3 of 3

**Comm. Klein** stated this project will be a good addition to neighborhood. The lot is large and similar to other houses in neighborhood. He also feels that having garages at the forefront of the home is not the best, but the bigger garage will alleviate some parking issues.

**Chair Moylan** added that with this home being a single-family unit rather than three separate rental units, that the number of cars parked in front of the house should be reduced.

## **Final Motion:**

Comm. Sulser made a motion on Item 2005-0287 for Alternative 1. to approve the design review with recommended conditions. Comm. Klein seconded.

Motion carried unanimously, 6-0 with Comm. Fussell absent.

Item is appealable to City Council no later than June 7, 2005.